

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/524,209	YAMAMOTO, MASAO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jordan M. Schwartz	2873	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jordan M. Schwartz.

(2) Steven Arnheim.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 June 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

7, 9-10, 12

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The changes to claims 7, 9-10 and 12 concerning changing "on or in" to "in" were discussed and agreed upon to provide additional clarity to applicant's intended meaning. Specifically, independent claims 9 and 10 claim "all of which are contained within said main body" which includes the display means thereby claiming the display in the main body. Therefore, further claiming that the display is "on or in the main body" is inconsistent and therefore the "on or in" was corrected to "in" to provide consistency and additional clarity. The additional changes to claims 9 and 10 were discussed and agreed upon to correct typographical errors.